

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 57th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Call to Order: By **CHAIRMAN GAY ANN MASOLO**, on March 21, 2001 at 3:12 P.M., in Room 137B Capitol.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Gay Ann Masolo, Chairman (R)
Rep. Kathleen Galvin-Halcro, Vice Chairman (D)
Rep. Bob Lawson, Vice Chairman (R)
Rep. Joan Andersen (R)
Rep. Gary Branae (D)
Rep. Nancy Fritz (D)
Rep. Verdell Jackson (R)
Rep. Hal Jacobson (D)
Rep. Larry Lehman (R)
Rep. Jeff Mangan (D)
Rep. Joe McKenney (R)
Rep. John Musgrove (D)
Rep. Alan Olson (R)
Rep. Ken Peterson (R)
Rep. Butch Waddill (R)
Rep. Allan Walters (R)
Rep. Merlin Wolery (R)

Members Excused: Rep. Norma Bixby (D)

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Connie Erickson, Legislative Branch
Nina Roatch, Committee Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted: SJ 10, 3/5/2001; SB 404,
3/5/2001
Executive Action: SJ 10; SB 35; SB 423; SB 182;
HJ 35

HEARING ON SJ 10

Sponsor: SENATOR SAM KITZENBERG, SD 48, Glasgow

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Informational: Bill Johnston, University of Montana System

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SENATOR SAM KITZENBERG, SD 48, Glasgow, said this is a very noncontroversial bill. This bill was part of a series of three bills and basically what he had in mind was that he was going to try to buy the Zortman Landusky Mine and the bankruptcy judge offered it to him for \$200,000. He wanted to mine it properly. There is a half billion dollars still in the ground. He wishes that it had all come together so that he could tell the Montana Legislature that he was presenting them with a half billion dollars for the general fund to spend as they please. The one big problem that deferred him was that when they received the cleanup money, they didn't get it in one lump sum. He was warned that if he shook it up too badly, the state might not even receive the \$30,000,000 for reclamation as was promised. The state should have received that money promptly and have it. Then his plan would have been more feasible. Part of it was this bill. Butte School of Mines has told him that there are four alternatives as far as mining is concerned. The problem is that they are not as economical as they should be. He met Lloyd Knutson to discuss gold mining. The end result of his study on mining gold is fertilizer. He is currently in China doing the process. He gave the **SPONSOR** a copy of The Knute Roe Natural Fertilizer Project. His cost for fertilizer is overwhelming. This is a big problem in the **SPONSOR's** area right now. The cost is doubling. He wishes we could get a process that is economically feasible. Through the bill hearings he has shared this information and also with the chancellor at Montana Tech and he has the project report in hand. The **SPONSOR** is not trying to give them the answers. The chancellor was very sincere and explained the project to him. The chancellor wanted to do this at the Zortman-Landusky Mine. He is just thinking of all the implications. There are other mines in Montana; there are a lot of mines. He believes there is a correlation between research and coming up with solutions to some of Montana's serious problems. Please notice the section of the bill that talks about the internship program. They have a current program, but it is more like a well-paid summer program. His idea of an internship

program is to go out and work on the mines. He could have bought the mine just for the paperwork and everything else was there as sort of an academic example that students who are going into mining could use. One of the things the school shared with him is the fact that it is quite a ways away and there are closer mines, etc. That is the idea behind the resolution. It has some merit and hopefully it will be taken seriously. It would have a tremendous impact if a solution can be reached. He wishes everything would have come together the way he had envisioned it.

Proponents' Testimony: None

Opponents' Testimony: None

Informational Testimony:

Bill Johnston, Lobbyist for University of Montana, representing Montana Tech, said he wished to explain to the committee that as they understand the resolution, they support it. They are looking for new mining techniques and also student internships.

Questions from Committee Members and Responses:

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON had a question for the **SPONSOR**. What would be the priorities of the program supported by the resolution? The **SPONSOR** said that he doesn't know all the resolutions that are there and so he couldn't answer the question. **REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON** asked if Montana truly has the equipment and the expertise to come up with an answer to question and much better institutions in the United States are working on similar projects? The **SPONSOR** said he doesn't know, that's why he visited with them. They seem to have a grasp of the situation. He would hope they do. He is bullish on Montana and the University System. He is looking for ways to fund it. He has hopes for the project that he has discussed with the committee. Mr. Knutson took this project to several places and he was told that they were very involved in the ammonia fertilizer idea and that is where their money is invested. What's so beautiful about this is, up in northeastern Montana, they are getting their fertilizer from Canada, and the mining fertilizer would be only half the cost of what is being paid at present. To come up with a good byproduct would be tremendous. It blows his mind that Mr. Knutson can go to China and do this and we can't do that in our own backyard when we have such tremendous resources that are undeveloped during such tremendous needs.

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said that this is a study resolution and therefore, would not need to be prioritized. He asked if he was correct. The **SPONSOR** said he believed he was correct.

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON had a question for the **SPONSOR**. If the legislature is going to direct the School of Mines to do something like this, would they have the funding available in their current budget? The **SPONSOR** said that question has been raised before the Senate. The school is not being given any money and that is a weakness in the resolution. He hopes the resolution will be taken in the spirit that it is offered. He would like to know the answer to the fertilizer problem.

Closing by Sponsor: None

HEARING ON SB 404

Sponsor: SENATOR EVE FRANKLIN, SD 21, Great Falls

Proponents: Jaybe Floyd, Great Falls

Opponents: None

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SENATOR EVE FRANKLIN, SD 21, said the bill is motivated by a constituent. Her, constituent, Ms. Jaybe Floyd, has found herself in an uncomfortable situation for sometime. She lives in an area in Cascade County that is a subdivision a few miles east of Great Falls. It is what's called a split school district. A split school district for her means she sends her children to the elementary school in Belt. Belt has a high school, but her children are in the Great Falls High School District and that is where they are designated to go to high school. She pays taxes in Great Falls and is able to vote for the school levy in Great Falls and also for the school levy in Belt. She isn't able to vote for trustees in the Great Falls High School District. She pays taxes into the Great Falls School District, but has no say on who represents her. The Senate Education Committee has worked with her and tried to come up with a solution. The bill says, "When a voting trustee position is designated pursuant to subsection (2)(c) for a territory without representation on the high school district board of trustees, one of the existing trustees must be designated as the trustee for the unrepresented territory for purposes of establishing trustee nominating districts under 20-3-353." In 1991, Wilbur Springs brought a similar issue to the legislature and the response was a little less aggressive than how they would like to deal with the present

situation. They designated someone to be responsible to those non-voting members. That isn't Mrs. Floyd's issue. Her issue is, appropriately so, that she pays taxes so she ought to have some input into who is actually controlling that money by virtue of her vote. She is not going to vote for every school board member, but there will be someone designated on the Great Falls School Board who she will vote for. She will have a sense of input into policy when she is paying taxes.

Proponents' Testimony:

Jaybe Floyd, Great Falls, said her situation is as **SENATOR FRANKLIN** described. She is not allowed to vote for a trustee on the Great Falls District School Board. She would like to vote. The board is making curriculum decisions and all kinds of other decisions that will affect her children when are old enough to go to the high school. She votes for the trustees in Belt because she can vote for elementary trustees. The Great Falls School District told her that the only kind of help she can get is from the legislature because of the way the statute is written. She would appreciate any help the committee can give because it is very important to her.

Opponents' Testimony: None

Questions from Committee Members and Responses:

REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN had a question for the **SPONSOR**. He asked for the numbers on the passage of this bill out of the Senate. The **SPONSOR** said the vote was 50-0. **REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN** said the bill refers only to voting for trustees. Is your constituent able to vote for levy elections in Great Falls? The **SPONSOR** said yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MASOLO asked the **SPONSOR** if **Ms. Floyd** is the only person with this problem in the area, or is this the only person who wants to vote? The **SPONSOR** said there are probably about one hundred or more people who are affected. **Ms. Floyd** brought this problem to the **SPONSOR** about four years ago, so she has been thinking about it for quite some time.

REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN had a question for the **SPONSOR**. The trustee position being talked about for the unrepresented territory, is that going to be like a percentage of the territory of the Great Falls School district? If there are seven trustees, would there be about one seventh of the territory carved out or one seventh of the taxable evaluation? The **SPONSOR** said it is already in law what the taxable evaluation is. They haven't changed that. MSBA had looked at making some changes, but

decided not to change the taxable evaluation formula. Only voters in that small geographical area of the split district will be able to vote for the trustee in the Great Falls School District. They are not adding a trustee. One trustee will be designated to represent that small area. **REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN** asked the committee if they had already heard a similar bill about the Kalispell area? They all agreed that they had. **REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN** asked if the trustee had to live in the small area and only the people in that same area could vote for that position. The **SPONSOR** said that is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN asked the **SPONSOR** if there was to be an additional trustee added to the present board? The **SPONSOR** said no. **REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN** asked, if one of the present trustees on the Great Falls board is going to be designated as the trustee for this particular area, does that trustee, in fact, have to live in that area or the property contiguous to that area? The **SPONSOR** said not to her knowledge. **REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN** asked if the seven members of the board of trustees in Great Falls are elected at large? The **SPONSOR** said that was correct. **REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN** continued. So the person designated to this small area could be any one of the seven trustees? The **SPONSOR** answered yes.

REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ asked the **SPONSOR** if her constituent would be allowed to run for the position of a trustee? The **SPONSOR** said that is a nonissue. It is outside of the borders of the bill. **REPRESENTATIVE FRITZ** said it makes sense that if she can vote for the position, she should be able to run for the position.

REPRESENTATIVE GALVIN-HALCRO asked the **SPONSOR** if there is anything that prevents her constituent from running for a position now? The **SPONSOR** said that she is not aware of any.

Closing by Sponsor:

SENATOR FRANKLIN said she would ask the committee to think of the bill in terms of basic fairness issues. It is unimaginable to her that her constituent would be put in the situation she finds herself in.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SJ 10

Motion: REP. GALVIN-HALCRO moved that **SJ 10 BE ADOPTED.**

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said he had a conceptual amendment. He talked to the **SPONSOR** and it is acceptable to him. Regarding the word "develop" on page 1, line 27, his amendment would be to strike the word "develop" and insert "encourage the study of."

Motion: REP. MANGAN moved that his **AMENDMENTS TO SJ 10 BE ADOPTED.** (SJ001001.ace) **EXHIBIT**(edh64a01)

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said the amendment will encourage the process rather than demand it. It is word-smithing. It has the same intent as the **SPONSOR** had when the bill was prepared.

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON said that he would support the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said he was not sure the amendment gets to what the **SPONSOR** wants the bill to do. He suggested that maybe it should say, "encourage the development of" instead of, "encourage the study of."

Substitute Motion: REP. PETERSON made a substitute motion that his **AMENDMENTS TO SJ 10 BE ADOPTED.**

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON said that he believes the word "development" has overtones of funding. He is not convinced that Montana Tech has the funding for development. The word "study" is more open and leaves them options to work with this program.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said he wished to withdraw his substitute motion.

Motion/Vote: REP. MANGAN moved his **AMENDMENT TO SJ 10** (SJ001001.ACE) **BE ADOPTED. Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion/Vote: REP. WALTERS moved that **SJ 10 BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.**

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HJ 35

Motion: REP. GALVIN-HALCRO moved that HJ 35 BE ADOPTED.

Discussion:

Motion: REP. MCKENNEY moved the AMENDMENT TO HJ 35 BE ADOPTED.
(HJ003501.ace) **EXHIBIT**(edh64a02)

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE MC KENNEY said if they would look at line 12, which reads, "whereas, today a post secondary degree or certificate is necessary for students to find work that provides a living wage." He thought that a little strong. There are many ways to make a living that do not require a degree. Some of those ways are: sales, building trades, entrepreneurship, etc. He would like to strike the word "necessary" and replace it with "advantageous" and strike "to find" and insert "seeking." The intent of HJ 35 is still intact. It is a friendly amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said he supports the amendment.

Motion/Vote: REP. MCKENNEY moved the AMENDMENT TO HJ 35 BE ADOPTED. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion/Vote: REP. MCKENNEY moved that HJ 35 BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 35

Motion: REP. LAWSON moved that SB 35 BE CONCURRED IN.

Discussion:

Amendments to the bill were passed out. **EXHIBIT**(edh64a03)

Motion: REP. MANGAN moved that AMENDMENTS (SB003501.ACE) BE ADOPTED.

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said he had been working with REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON on the amendments. He had shared his thoughts with the sponsor of the bill. The three of them had been exchanging thoughts on the amendments for some time. During the hearing a couple of things were brought up by SENATOR BISHOP.

The Senate changed the bill to read that school uniforms would be permissive. **REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN** said that the bill doesn't say it is permissive. His first amendment would make it permissive when the word "assess" is removed and "consider assessing" is inserted. During **SENATOR BISHOP**'s opening discussion of the bill, he passed out a packet of information. The first four pages of the packet listed what makes a school uniform policy work. He had highlighted the information. He took, from what **SENATOR BISHOP** handed out, the four areas that address the concerns the committee had during the hearing. If a school district should adopt a policy, it must include the provisions of the second amendment. **SENATOR BISHOP** does not oppose the amendments.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said that what **REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN** has said is correct. The amendments come out of California law. The language of the amendments is the same language as is found in California code. He would support the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE WOLERY said that he finds (c) in the second amendment to be an oxymoron. It looks to him like the committee is going two different directions with the same bucket of water. He is confused by saying the uniform is mandatory and then putting in a clause that says the student is allowed the option of not wearing the uniform.

REPRESENTATIVE MASOLO said that she agrees with **REPRESENTATIVE WOLERY**.

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN stated that opt-out provisions are necessary. With parental consent, the provision has to exist. You can't force someone to wear a uniform. That would get you in more trouble, if you try that without an opt-out provision. Language, like the one proposed, is going to help the school district if a suit is filed by the family. Without this language, school districts are going to get sued. All the research that the men have been able to gather have opt-out provisions in their school uniform policy.

REPRESENTATIVE WOLERY said he can support the amendments if the words "if a school uniform policy is mandatory," are deleted from section (c) in the second amendment. He would so move.

Substitute Motion: REP. WOLERY made a substitute motion that AMENDMENT TO SB 35 BE ADOPTED.

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON said he believes there is a difference between an opt-out provision and allowing a student the option of not wearing the uniform. When a school has a dress code in place, there is a provision to challenge the dress code. Just because there is a provision for opt-out, a student may not necessarily opt-out. He believes it is appropriate to have an opt-out clause in the manner **REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN** has stated it. He believes it is mandatory and appropriate to have an opt-out provision.

REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN said **REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN** mentioned allowing the student the opt-out option with parental consent. Maybe parental consent should be in the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said his intention was not to set the policy for every school district. He is just giving minimum guidelines. **SENATOR BISHOP** was hoping that any school adopting a dress code would have a lengthy policy that has been worked out with community, parents, board, etc. It will take research and the information is not hard to find.

REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN said he could see the need for opt-out provisions. What would happen if a student was mandated to wear wool a certain part of the year and he is allergic to wool? What if a student had a disfigurement that the designated uniform would not cover?

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said the committee needs to keep in mind that this is a direction to the school boards who adopt it. If they adopt a mandatory uniform policy, they have to adopt an opt-out provision for them. The board has to fill in the blanks. He likes the language the way it was before and he is against the substitute amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON stated that any school policy is appealable to the board. Every policy is referenced to code and one of the codes that is referenced often is 20-3-324, Powers and Duties of the Board of Trustees. It can be worded anyway the committee wants to. The public can still appeal it to the board.

Motion/Vote: REP. WOLERY moved that **SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO SB 35 BE ADOPTED**. Motion failed 7-11 with Branae, McKenney, Musgrove, Olson, Waddill, Walters, and Wolery voting aye.

Motion/Vote: REP. MANGAN moved that **AMENDMENTS TO SB 35 (SB003401.ACE) BE ADOPTED. Motion carried 12-6 with Andersen, Lawson, Masolo, Musgrove, Waddill, and Walters voting no.**

Motion: REP. LAWSON moved that **SB 35 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED.**

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON said Billings has already proved that we do not need this bill in the statute. He is going to vote against the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said he is going to vote for the bill because he believes it sends a message to the school boards that they do have the authority to adopt a uniform code. He questions whether they do have without this bill. He has done research and a school board is classified as a local government. Any local government that doesn't have a self-government power can only do what is authorized, or is implied to be authorized, by the legislature. If someone had challenged the Billings school, it might have been a different story. Everyone that he has talked to who has experienced school uniforms thinks it is the best thing since sliced bread. The people who don't like it, appear to be those who have never experienced it. It is not mandatory and up to the local school district. He would prefer it be mandatory and required statewide, that is how much he is in favor of the idea.

{Tape :1; Side : B}

REPRESENTATIVE BRANAE said the school that adopted the uniform policy in Billings has found it to be very successful. The chairman of the district school board in Billings believes it has been successful and believes the board had the authority without legislation to adopt the uniform policy. It should be a local issue.

REPRESENTATIVE JACOBSON said he has served on a school board and he believes that the ability of a school to develop a dress code is the same as the ability to adopt a school uniform. He sees no need for the bill and will vote against it.

REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN said the Billings school that adopted a uniform code started with the parents getting involved. The parents went to the school board. This bill is asking that it be done from the top down and it is much more effective if it is from the bottom up. She is not in favor of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSGROVE said he doesn't believe the bill is necessary.

Motion/Vote: REP. LAWSON moved that **SB 35 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED**. Motion failed 4-14 with Jackson, Mangan, Peterson, and Walters voting aye.

Motion: REP. LAWSON moved **REVERSE THE VOTE ON SB 35 AND TABLE**.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 423

Motion: REP. WALTERS moved that **SB 423 BE CONCURRED IN**.

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE BRANAE said that he has struggled with this bill. **Rodney Garcia** was here and spoke during the hearing and he lives near to where the Representative lives. He later talked to the school board in Billings. He believes what started the controversy in Billings was the talk of school closures. Several of the schools that were rumored to be closed were in the less economic advantaged area in Billings. **Mr. Garcia** felt that a single member district would bring his area of the city some representation. Most of the trustees in Billings do come from a certain area. In talking with the school board, they are very much opposed to single member districts because they feel it causes division within the district as a whole. She thinks it will cause one school to be pitted against another one, if it does come to an issue of school closures. In terms of minorities, it is possible under the present law to establish single member districts, if there are problems do to minorities. It is happening right now in Harden because the Indians contend they do not have equal representation. At present there is a minority member on the Billings board and there have been trustees from the area on the board in the past. The problem is getting people to run for the position and also to get people out to vote. He is leaning against the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON said talking to the school board members in Billings is like talking to the fox about his guarding the hen house. The people on the board live in the northeast corner of Billings. It is the high rent district. **Rodney Garcia** is a community activist and **REPRESENTATIVE PETERSON** has known him for more than twenty years. The Representative believes the people on the south side of Billings need some representation. The way it is now, there will never be representation from the south side. That is the minority area and they need representation. He supports the bill. The school board members didn't show

interest and come to the legislature and testify on the bill. They could have come and told the committee their thoughts. The policy exists in other governmental concepts, such as election of county commissioners.

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON said the voters have to decide the issue. This bill doesn't require districts. A petition has to be presented, it has to go on the ballot. Let the people in the district decide.

REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN said he can see, if in fact a certain area did meet the requirements and garner their 10%, there could be a tendency to polarize the board of trustees to where they could become ineffective as a board. There would never be cohesiveness to anything they wanted to do. In the long run, the district could suffer. School closures could cause great disputes, especially in this time we are living in and they are great realities. Trustees are going to try to protect their district.

REPRESENTATIVE LAWSON stated that we have no testimony from the Billings school board, but the committee had no testimonies from other towns and areas. He believes this is a Billings issue that needs to be addressed by Billings folks and not the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE JACOBSON said he agrees with many of the comments. He can see problems cropping up at election time, when they might not be able to get enough names on the ballot.

REPRESENTATIVE OLSON said they are other bills coming in the future. Districts may not consolidate, but it sees unification of districts happening. We are going to need district representation, so we will need this option to take care of some of the fears of unification and consolidation. If the voters want it, they can have it. The 10% is on the petition. It has to go to the electorate.

REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN stated that she has a lot of school districts in her district. She has constituents who sit on a school board so that their small area is represented because their high school has been closed.

REPRESENTATIVE MASOLO said she is going to vote for the bill because she believes the people who came to the hearing truly want to be represented.

Motion/Vote: REP. WALTERS moved that **SB 423 BE CONCURRED IN.**
Motion failed 9-9.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 182

Motion: REP. MANGAN moved that **SB 182 BE CONCURRED IN.**

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN reviewed the bill for the committee. The bill will allow, in particular rural districts, to work together to hire a teacher, specialist or superintendent so they can share the services and thus save the districts some money. He sees it as a good idea, particularly when teacher shortage is an issue. Rural districts also have a difficult time filling the position of specialists in the speech and hearing areas. The way the current bill is written, sharing these positions would not be allowed. That is not part of the original bill. He is offering amendments that would allow for inter-local cooperation in the joint hiring or joint contracting for those additional specialists that school districts need to utilize and work with. We have a shortage of those people in the areas mentioned. He has talked to Lance Melton and Bob Vogel and they weren't sure there was a need for the amendment. Maybe schools can do this now, but he wants to be sure they can. Amendments were handed out. (SB018201.ace) **EXHIBIT**(edh64a04)

Motion: REP. MANGAN moved that **AMENDMENT TO SB 182 BE ADOPTED.**

Discussion:

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said the amendment expands the ability of districts to work together to hire qualified people, regardless of their title.

REPRESENTATIVE LEHMAN said the term specialists in the title, in his opinion, would cover the kinds of people that **REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN** was talking about. That is his impression.

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said that was his initial belief, but apparently that is not true. Specialists refers to course specialists, like a reading specialist.

Connie Erickson said that her understanding is that a speech pathologist can be certified with a special certification. What the amendment would cover could be a school nurse. Nurses are not termed as certified. Perhaps a psychologist, a social worker, or a licensed counselor would fit into the wording of the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN said he knows there is question about the need for the amendment, but he would rather be safe than sorry.

Motion/Vote: REP. MANGAN moved that AMENDMENT TO SB 182 BE ADOPTED. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion/Vote: REP. MANGAN moved that SB 182 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. Motion carried unanimously.

REPRESENTATIVE MANGAN WILL CARRY THE BILL.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 4:45 P.M.

REP. GAY ANN MASOLO, Chairman

NINA ROATCH, Secretary

GM/NR

EXHIBIT (edh64aad)